

March 29, 1976

CLERK: Wherever the word applies would be applicable throughout the bill, then.

SENATOR FOWLER: Okay, it will be harmonized throughout the bill.

CLERK: The word will not be defined more than once in the Act.

SENATOR FOWLER: Okay, but every point after that where the language is used, the new word will be inserted, changing like lobbyist to principal, I believe, so then from there on out in the Act where lobbyist appears, it will be changed to principal?

CLERK: It should be picked up that way by E & R but that will be a tricky one to pick up, too.

SENATOR KOCH: If we can make, part of the amendment, if it is adopted, if we were to make a notation to the fact that wherever the term lobby agent is used that the word principal shall be substituted and wherever the term lobby agent there shall be substituted the term lobbyist as we have always known it and there are a number of places in the bill where that term is used and we are merely changing it back.

CLERK: What I can do, Senator Koch, is write on the bottom of your amendment, correct all internal references to conform.

SENATOR KOCH: That is correct. That is what we are talking about. Thank you, Mr. Brown. Thank you. Mr. President, I move for the adoption of the amendment, if there is no other discussion.

PRESIDENT: Any further discussion? The question is the adoption of Senator Koch's second amendment. Record your vote. Please vote. Record.

CLERK: 27 ayes, 0 nays.

PRESIDENT: The amendment carries. Senator Koch.

CLERK: The next amendment, Mr. President, is on page 47, lines 26 and 27, after "filed" on line 26, strike ", and a general description of its position on each."

SENATOR KOCH: Mr. President and members of the body, once again, we are looking at a term that is rather vaguely defined and really in my mind has no disclosing effect. As an example, a lobbyist from a certain association representing an industry must, of necessity, answer in vague terms such as in favor of good legislation in that industry or opposed to anti business legislation or whatever it might be. So what we are doing here is we are striking out the last line. I think it would only necessitate a considerable amount of additional paperwork that really would be meaningless because we know what that person is lobbying for in relation to whatever agency